

Appl. No. 09/420,887  
Supplemental Amdt. dated 11/02/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 5/27/2004

### REMARKS

This Amendment is in further response to the Office Action mailed 5/27/2004. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

The Examiner rejects claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Intel Offers SDRAM Alternative to Rambus on Camino Chipset* from Computergram International (Computergram).

Applicant's disclosure of his or her own work within the year before the application filing date cannot be used against him or her under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982). ... The rejection can also be overcome by submission of a specific declaration by the applicant establishing that the article is describing applicant's own work. *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1982). MPEP § 2132.01.

Applicant submits a declaration herewith by the applicant establishing that the article is describing applicant's own work and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) being anticipated by Computergram.


The declarations previously submitted were inadvertently submitted without signatures. Signed declarations are submitted herewith.

#### *Conclusion*

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

By   
James Henry  
Reg. No. 41,064  
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

Dated: November 2, 2004